

## **BEAVERTON BOARD DESIGN AND REVIEW**

**August 12, 1999**

**CALL TO ORDER:**

Chairman Dave Williams called the meeting to order at 6:30 pm in the Beaverton City Hall Council Chambers at 4755 SW Griffith Drive.

**ROLL CALL:**

Present were Chairman Dave Williams; Board Members Hal Beighley, Renee Cannon, Anissa Crane, and Stewart Straus. Walter Lemon was excused.

Staff was represented by Associate Planner Colin Cooper, Senior Planner John Osterberg, and Recording Secretary Cheryl Gonzales.

### **OLD BUSINESS**

#### **Continuances**

Chairman Williams read the format for the meeting. There were no disqualifications of Board members. No one in the audience challenged the right of any member of the Board to participate in the hearings. Chairman Williams asked if anyone wanted to request a continuance to a later date for any agenda item.

**A. BDR99056/TPP99004 MAGNOLIA GREEN**

*(Request for continuance to August 26, 1999)*

Request for approval to construct approximately 200 townhomes and condominiums with associated parking and landscaping. The proposal includes a pad for a commercial building and associated parking on the northeast portion of the site, abutting SW Millikan Way. The applicant also requests approval of a Tree Preservation Plan, TPP 99004, because the site contains trees identified as Grove 38 on the City's Inventory of Significant Trees. The site is within the Station Area-Medium Density (SA-MDR) zone. The site is located at the NW corner of Millikan and TV Highway, and is approximately 19.08 acres in size. Map 1S1-08; Tax Lot 2400.

**B. BDR98097/VAR98009 PRECISION AUTO BUILDING ADDITION**

*(Request for continuance to September 23, 1999)*

Request for Design Review approval to construct an approximately 8,732 square foot secondary building at the existing Precision Auto site. The building proposes ten automobile

bays in which additional off-street parking is being proposed to allow for the increased parking requirements. A Design Variance is also being requested to reduce the required rear setback from 20 feet to 9 feet. The site is within the General Commercial (GC) zone. The site is located south of SW Carousel Court, west of SW 141st Avenue, north of SW Tualatin Valley Highway, east of SW 144th Avenue, and is approximately 1.08 acres in size. Map 1S1-9CC, Tax Lot 3200.

C. **BDR99079/TPP99003 POORMAN DOUGLAS PARKING**

*(Request for continuance to September 23, 1999)*

Request for approval of a parking lot addition for the Poorman Douglas building, located at 10300 SW Allen Boulevard. The proposal includes placement of the parking lot addition of approximately 100 parking spaces at the rear of the existing building on the southern portion of the site, constructing another entry into the building adjacent to the proposed parking addition and associated landscaping. The applicant also requests approval of a Tree Preservation Plan, TPP 99003, because the site contains trees identified as Grove 12 on the City's Inventory of Significant Trees. The site is within the Industrial Park (IP) zone and is approximately 8.42 acres in size. Map 1S1-23BB; Tax Lot 300.

Mr. Beighley MOVED and Ms. Crane SECONDED a motion to continue BDR99056/TPP99004 Magnolia Green to August 26, 1999; BDR99079/TPP99003 Poorman Douglas Parking to September 23, 1999; and BDR98097/VAR98009 Precision Auto Building Addition to September 23, 1999.

The question was called and the motion CARRIED unanimously.

**Public Hearing**

A. **BDR99035 - GRAMOR MURRAY SCHOLLS**

*(Continued from July 22, 1999)*

Request for Design Review approval for approximately 165,250 square feet of the commercial use center. The Design Review request includes review of nine new buildings and one existing building to be remodeled. The Planning Commission will hear the applicants request for Conditional Use Permit approval for a Planned Unit Development (PUD) on 21.2 acres of the former PGE site on the northwest corner of SW Murray Boulevard and SW Scholls Ferry Road. The PUD request is to be in multiple phases to include proposed retail, office uses, restaurants, and approximately 20 townhomes on the northeast corner of the site. Proposed access points include one on SW Murray Boulevard and three on SW Scholls Ferry Road. The development proposal is on Tax Lots 100 and 800 of Assessor's Map 1S1-32DA and is zoned Town Center – Sub Regional. The site is within the R5, TC-SR, LI zone. Map 1S1-32DA; Tax Lots 100, 500, 700 & 800, and Map 1S1-32AD; Tax Lots 800 & 900.

Mr. Cooper stated that approval was being sought for several buildings in this proposal. Mr. Cooper indicated some basic parameters: The site zoning was for Town Center Sub-Region (TCSR). Prior to the Board of Design Review hearing, there were two Planning Commission (PC) hearings where a Conditional Use Permit was approved. Town Center Sub Regional (TC-SR) was applied to the site as the interim zone during a larger planning process. A provision was added in to the TC-SR zone requiring a Planned Unit Development for more oversight. The Applicant's site plan was approved by the PC on August 11, 1999.

Mr. Cooper further stated that he had provided the Board a memo, dated this date, describing the Conditions and Modifications that were placed on the application by the Planning Commission. The intent of the TC-SR zone was flexibility, in order to give any potential developer operating room within that zone. This was similar to the existing Town Center (TC) zone because the Applicant was trying to create an urban zone. He added the applicant's proposal had clearly met the approval criteria. This was confirmed by the PC in their approval.

Mr. Cooper stated the purpose of this meeting was to decide whether to approve the eight new buildings proposed for the site. Staff had reviewed the application and recommended approval. With regard to the review, it was staff's feeling that all the buildings were very well designed and the entire project had been brought together very well considering some of the site constraints. Staff recommended its approval.

Referring back to the Facilities Review Conditions (FRC), Mr. Cooper stated that some were listed on the memo. The most important of these, which carried over to the BDR was a request for an allowance for off-site improvements and to obtain a Certificate of Occupancy for a sixth structure, the PC had modified the FRC to allow that to occur. Originally, the improvements had been tied to a Certificate of Occupancy for a fourth structure occupied on the site. A second item of note was the PC required installation of a speed table at the north access point of site, where Teal Boulevard is accessed and where there was no prescribed width. Mr. Cooper advised that the Applicant may accommodate ten feet, but their intentions should be ascertained. Staff mentioned this to Planning Commissioners but there was no specific motion made. Also, all head-in parking was conditioned to the to the "as depicted" on the site plan.

Mr. Cooper stated that staff was also recommending the addition of the 21st Condition, that the Application shall be contingent upon final approval of CUP99003. This was to insure that were the application concerning the buildings approved, a valid CUP was in place. The Land Use Order was not as yet signed.

Mr. Straus asked, with reference to the memo, what type of parking was being referred to. Mr. Cooper replied that it was in fact referring to the staff having compromised 90 degree parking on the north side of the access driveway in consideration for closing some of the

access isles into parking fields on the south side. There were approximately 13 spaces left on the west side by the Applicant on the site plan. However, the PC chose to have those eliminated. Mr. Straus concluded that the issues were not one of head-in, head-out maneuverings, but rather location. Mr. Cooper clarified this in stating that at issue were: first, the length of the parking spaces; and secondly, parking on the south side of the driveway isle (which he pointed to on the map).

Ms. Cannon asked if in fact this were a Conditional Use Permit. Mr. Cooper explained that any development on a TCSR, whether a Permitted or Conditional Use, it had to be done under the provisions of a PUD. He stated that in Beaverton's Development Code, a PUD is Conditional Use.

Mr. Cooper stated there were two affirmations of the proposal: staff had recommended approval of both the PUD and the CUP; the Planning Commission had approved it without substantial reconditioning. Also, the staff was recommending approval of the BDR.

At this time, the Applicant's representatives were introduced:

MR. BARRY CAIN, President, Gramor, 9895 SE Sunnyside Road, Clackamas, Oregon, 97015.

MR. MATT GRADY, Gramor, 9895 SE Sunnyside Road, Clackamas, Oregon 97015.

MR. MICHAEL LEE, Sienna Architecture; 411 SW 6<sup>th</sup> Avenue, Portland, OR 97204.

MR. JEFF LIGHTHEART, 8515-B NE Hazel Dell Avenue, Vancouver, WA., 98665, Beaches Restaurant Design.

MR. MICHAEL ODREN, Christopher Freshley Landscape Architect, 1020 SW Taylor, #355, Portland, Oregon 97205.

MR. TIM GASCHKE, Kurahashi and Associates, Civil Engineering , 12600 SW 72<sup>nd</sup> Avenue, Tigard, OR 97223.

MR. CARL SPRINGER, Traffic and Transportation (no card).

Mr. Grady stated they concurred with the Conditions of Approval in the staff report. He passed out the Design Standards Booklet for visualization; and a folded set of landscape plans with some changes, marked MOA Final Approval. Also distributed was a site plan, the western side which was an amendment from the Planning Commission meeting of August 11. It was their decision not to allow 90 degree parking on both sides. Applicant's alternative in response to this was to remove the drive-in feature (of the bank) and slide the same size building closer to the access drive. Mr. Grady stated they were requesting the Board to consider this in their action tonight, particularly as an indication of the direction they would be taking with the project.

Next, Mr. Barry Cain discussed the fundamental facts of how the project arrived and evolved; PGE's participation as co-applicant, along with Murray Home Owners Association. Gramor's involvement began in June 1995 with the ownership of Murray Hill

Marketplace; and later the purchase of an additional 3.2 acres with two existing buildings. The work began with the remodel of these two buildings: a 35,000 square foot PGE office building and the rear building was a garage/warehouse. The exhibit captured well, the before condition of the buildings and after. Both related comfortably to the new design of the Center. Metro One telecommunications has moved into the former office building and is one of the five fastest growing companies in Oregon. Mr. Cain continued to describe the placement of the following buildings as a logical progression and their multi-uses. The gas station location aroused most of the interest of the surrounding neighborhoods, supporting its implementation. As a buffer, a brick wall was constructed and mature trees added. There were some grade problems that were met, placing building 8 on top of 9 to compensate for transition. The Beaches Restaurant was set alongside the lake.

Mr. Michael Lee, Sienna Architecture, described the plan in more detail, including building elevations, materials, site details. He pointed out the pedestrian and vehicular connections, multi-access points, raised pedestrian crosswalks/tables to calm traffic, trail systems: how oversized plaza areas were provided and amenities spaced in front of the retail buildings; and the techniques of bringing the character of the buildings to the street. Mr. Lee added that much site work grading had been done (sunken plaza area, cascaded landscaping beds) as well as a demonstrative entry statement with special signage area to set the tone on the overall quality of the Center. The overlook area was designed especially for the water.

Mr. Lee continued with a more detailed description of the individual buildings:

The existing building 1, (formerly the PGE building): remodeled.

The existing repair garage/warehouse: added storefronts, moved walls, concrete tile roof system made new windows in the back of the building.

Building 3, retail/office: more attention to detail; i.e. raised cornices, arched cornices, pavilion shapes, flat canopies as covering devices, metal awnings, arcaded elements, different colors of brick.

Building 4: designed to help screen the existing research lab and new substation, by the addition of a 35 foot element; used flat canopies, awnings, arcades, raised cornices.

Buildings 5, 6 7: brought to the street at storefront, to provide direct pedestrian connections from the sidewalks.

Buildings 8, 9: took advantage of the grade difference on the site, nestling one building on top of the other.

Building 11: went through a number of designs on this building, added sill panels in the storefronts, trellis, metal canopies, featured roof elements that wrap around.

Mr. Lightheart gave a brief overview of the Beaches building 10. Siting was set with a major dining area with a view toward the water feature. The building design was a "cabin theme", having a river rock base, board and bat style siding, some cedar siding in the gable ends of the building. Building roof was a gable type with composition shingles.

Mr. Michael Odren, Landscape Architect, discussed the urban setting of the site with natural features. He described the various components of street- scaping, interior parking, entries, pedestrian areas, plazas, bufferings, unique feature sites, i.e. Beaches Restaurant and the pond area--what was needed to perform year-round in the sense of color, texture, form, throughout the site. The intent overall was that the landscaping itself, along with the architectural, would tie in so well together, that were a person anywhere on the site, he would know that he was still on that site.

Mr. Straus commented that some of the islands within the parking area appeared to be smaller than what was normally required by the Development Code. Mr. Lee responded that all the islands were per the code. A distinction was made concerning dimensions of the planting islands; Mr. Straus stated they looked considerably smaller than what was normally expected, possibly to maximize parking. However, the Development Code and Conditions of Approval require a specific size. Mr. Grady expressed that he was under the assumption they had met the numerical requirements and not all dimensions were matching. The plan which was produced last night was an attempt to get the image across, without taking the time to work with the landscape architect to make certain that the islands were in conformance with the widths and dimensions as required by BDR Condition. This was also the case near building 8.

To help clarify this situation, Mr. Cooper stated that the standard that Mr. Straus had referred to was not an actual Development Code requirement, it was a Board of Design Review Condition of Approval. In the staff review, it was noticed the number of parking lot landscaped trees in conjunction with the number of spaces being provided, matched that condition; and that some islands were less than the full eight feet. But in overall balance the design was good. Staff felt that Applicant's plan met the intent and purpose of providing shading and break-up for the parking lot. Mr. Straus was concerned about the species of tree selected not surviving if the planter width was too small. Mr. Odren responded that the tree species selected would not have a problem with their root systems. Mr. Straus questioned as to whether there would be any conflict with trees in the planters and lighting, the fixtures being placed away from the planters. It was answered that the trees used in these situations were more columnar.

Mr. Cooper added that at the time staff was going over the plan, looking at parking lots between building 3 and 2; building 1 and 2; it was noticed that some parking lot islands smaller than the eight feet standard condition, however, in counting the number of trees, it was found there was considerably more trees than were required. Staff was satisfied that Gramor was successful breaking up the large parking field.

Mr. Beighley suggested the use of root barriers on both sides of those planters. He also asked for clarification on building 2, an existing building, has it been remodeled? Mr. Cain

answered that building 1 was the only building remodeled, under Light Industrial Zoning, Type 2 exterior remodel, and is occupied.

Ms. Crane asked about the lack of landscape detail near the townhomes, was it a separate application? Mr. Grady replied that this was a Phase D and this would be the case.

Ms. Cannon also asked where the locations of the bus stops were. Mr. Grady stated that there was one by building 10; Mr. Lee added that there was one across the street. Mr. Lee also indicated they would be adding a proposed bus stop for the #62 route, just to the east of building 10. Mr. Grady added that they have yet to meet with Tri-Met to confirm a structure.

Ms. Cannon questioned the location of bicycle stalls. Mr. Grady stated they would be found on the detailed site plan sheets. Number, count, and location were in association with each building. It was also stated there was some concern about the ducks from letters received from neighbors around the site. Mr. Grady reassured the Board that the ducks would not go away, they were a consideration at the time the landscaping was being performed around the lake, allowances were made to make it easier for them to come out at certain areas. With regard to the Beaches building being decidedly different or not consistent with the other buildings, Mr. Cain stated that that was intentional as Beaches wanted to maintain their specific identity, the building is a "signature" type building.

Mr. Cain stated that this development had two themes: the one on the upper level and the one on the lake which includes Beaches and the rowhomes, but they do tie in overall.

Chairman Williams stated there were no additional cards from the public on this issue. Mr. Cooper asked for a momentary recess to talk to the Applicant.

Five minute recess was held and the meeting reconvened.

Mr. Cooper updated the Board with regard to the Partial Site Plan Alternative, 2B, passed this evening, building 6 would be the same elevations as the bank building in the elevations in the Board's packages, The Applicant asked approval for building 6 without the canopy for the drive-through, otherwise it was the same structure. Mr. Cooper recommended that the Board add a Condition that the Applicant be required to return to staff with a Type I Design Review, for Landscaping Modifications around the building. He also recommended that the Board make a Condition that accepts the Landscape Plan sheet provided this evening. Staff reviewed and was comfortable with the additions that were made which were minor in nature. This would be in lieu of the landscape sheet in the Board's package. Mr. Cooper noted that the plan in question was dated July 29, 1999.

Chairman Williams closed the public portion hearing on this item.

Mr. Straus MOVED and Mr. Beighley SECONDED a motion to approve BDR 99035 - Gramor Murray Scholls, based upon the testimony, reports and exhibits presented during the public hearing on the matter and upon the background facts, findings, and conclusions, found in the Staff Report dated August 12, 1999 including Conditions 1 through 20, plus the following additional Conditions:

21: This Application shall be contingent upon final approval of CUP99003.

22: Alternate Site Plan 2B, distributed at the meeting of August 12, 1999, showing revisions in the vicinity of buildings 5 and 6, and shall be in lieu of previous layout. The landscaping in this area shall be resubmitted to staff as a Type 1 Review.

23: Landscape Sheet, dated July 29, 1999, provided at the meeting of August 12, 1999, shall be in lieu of the previous plan submitted.

The question was called and the motion CARRIED unanimously.

A break was called and the meeting was reconvened.

Mr. Straus stated he was filling in as chairman since Chairman Williams had to leave the meeting.

**B. BDR99029 ST. MARY'S HOME FOR BOYS; PHASE 3 BUILDINGS**

Request for approval to construct a building addition and three new buildings on the site, located at 16535 SW Tualatin Valley Highway, west of Millikan Way. The proposed building addition is an addition to the existing Heesaker Hall classroom building. The proposed new buildings include a Chapel, a Community Services building, and a Recreation facility. Landscaping and parking additions are also proposed. The site is with the Residential Urban High-Density (R1) zone. The site is approximately 29.08 acres in size. Map 1S1-08; Tax Lot 600.

Mr. Osterberg stated that the applicant had an approved Master Plan, which called for three phases of development. They are ready for phase three of the proposal which was a group of four buildings and one building addition. Mr. Osterberg summarized the important issues making note that the City had recommended denial of this application. However, he stated that the issue responsible for this action at the time it was written had been resolved. Staff now recommended approval of the project which has 17 Conditions of Approval, all of which are standard except in the way Condition 15 was modified. Condition 15 was the City's recommendation that the Facilities Review Conditions be adopted. However, staff recommended that the Committee's Conditions be modified with a change to Facilities Review Condition C3; 15a, 15b, pages 18, 19, described a new condition to address the issue of the sidewalk. The Applicant had requested some flexibility in the timing of the construction of the sidewalk. The City agreed to allow the TV



Highway sidewalk to be constructed at a future time. Mr. Osterberg stated that basically Condition 15 gave the Applicant a choice: to either construct the sidewalk with their other improvements that are under the Site Development Permit for Phase 3; or they can delay it until such time that a sidewalk on an abutting property was brought up to the edge of the St. Mary's Home for Boy's Property. Mr. Osterberg added that 15b brought up the language of Performance Security which is in part standard.

Mr. Cannon asked that if the proposed Magnolia Green Apartments were to come in, would their sidewalk abut that property. Mr. Osterberg responded it would.

Chairman Straus commented that earlier, at the time of the approval of the Master Plan, first phase, there was no stipulation as to Performance Security in conjunction with the original approval. That being the case, why would Performance Security be requested at this time. Mr. Osterberg replied that it was to insure the sidewalk be constructed, being this was the final phase. Chairman Straus stated that were St. Mary's to choose Option B, the other abutting sidewalk trigger, there was no time frame deadline, only the statement, "within a reasonable amount of time". Mr. Osterberg shared this concern and stated he had contacted the City Engineer. The recommendation was that the City Engineer would send a letter to the property owner informing him that a sidewalk had now been provided to his property line and was abutting said property; and as per the previous Condition of Approval by the BDR, said property owner's sidewalk was now required to be constructed. He would at that time need to apply for a Site Development Permit Issuance.

Ms. Cannon discussed with Mr. Osterberg the future possibility that TV Highway might become larger to accommodate the traffic load and that it was important to give St. Mary's as much flexibility as possible. Mr. Osterberg commented that St. Mary's would construct the sidewalk at the ultimate grade and location which would accommodate the future widening. TV Highway had enough request for right-of-way to provide a seven lane facility: three travel lanes in each direction with a center left turn lane. The sidewalk location would then compliment this action so that it would not have to be torn out or removed at a later time.

Chairman Straus commented that the application coming through from Magnolia Green has a sidewalk shown for TV Highway, indicating that this one, then, would have to be connected to St. Mary's. Mr. Osterberg agreed that it would likewise have to meet the same kind of standard, at the ultimate grade and locations to accommodate the future widening of TV Highway.

APPLICANT:

MS. EMMA DENNIS, Director, St. Mary's Home for Boys, 16535 SW TV Highway, Beaverton, Oregon, 97006.

MR. JEFF CLAY, WRG Design, Civil Consultant, 10450 SW Nimbus Avenue, Portland, Oregon 97223.

MR. JIM GRADY, Architect, 11350 SE Peggy Way, Clackamas, Oregon 97015.

Mr. Grady discussed the layout of the buildings according to the master plan from 1993. He distributed a similar copy of this plan with overlay, illustrating two new issues: first; was the addition of Howard Hall, which will replace four portable buildings (they will be taken off site), plus the addition to the already existing Heesaker Hall; and secondly, the original play area and gymnasium had now been removed due to obsolescence. These were being replaced by a fitness course. Also, the parking type in front of the Community Service building had been modified from a one-way, diagonal parking situation, to a 20 foot wide, two-way circulation pattern which would act as the Fire Access Road. In having done this, nearly all vehicular traffic would be concentrated in the one building area, this was to the south. The campus would become a walking campus. The original lighting plan had been carried out; and the landscaping the same. There would, however, be new street lighting because of the two new buildings. Landscape buffering, colors, materials for cottages, remained the same. A Perspective Rendering Board and a Materials Board were displayed and illustrated these items.

Concerning the sidewalk, on July 22, 1993, the Chairman at that time, drew up a Non-Remonstrance Agreement that required St. Mary's to place a sidewalk when and only when development took place on either side of the property. As to the timeliness of "when", that was discussed earlier, St. Mary's was agreeable to the Board's "when".

MR. MARV DOTY, 7350 SW Wilson Avenue, Beaverton, Oregon, Chairman of the Highland Neighborhood Association, Member of Make Our Park Whole Task Force Team, appeared on behalf of the committees to express views and opinions in support of the St. Mary's Expansion Plan. He reported that technical and design standards were thorough and met code requirements. The school has been there on its site for 110 years and history has proved that the facility and management were very compatible in addressing the significant natural resources within this large area. The 100 year flood plain has been identified and wetlands were not affected in this new construction plan. Street and campus lighting had been designated with various safeguards. The relationship with the components of the expansion plan appeared to be excellent. The quality features of health, safety and sanitation procedures, early lights out and shut down for night were very appropriate. His groups were very comfortable with this program and pleased to add their support and recommendation for approval of the BDR confirmation. Ms. Cannon expressed her appreciation for their support.

Chairman Straus advised that before putting the motion together, wording for the 15b item be structured so as to recognize a time frame with regard to the abutting property sidewalk trigger. Ms. Cannon stated that she was comfortable with the language there, as it addressed Performance Security, and was firmly in place. She also added that the

engineering department could adjust the time frame of occurrence by the progress of the sidewalk construction of the abutting property. The Board was in consensus with this.

Ms. Cannon MOVED and Mr. Beighley SECONDED a motion to approve BDR99029, based upon the testimony, reports and exhibits presented during the public hearing on the matter and upon the background facts and findings and conclusions found in the Staff Report dated August 12, 1999, including Conditions 1 through 17.

The question was called and the motion CARRIED unanimously.

C. **TPP99-00009 TENNIS COURT ADDITION AT HOWARD TERPENNING**

Request for approval to construct an outdoor tennis court at the Howard M. Terpenning Recreation Complex, located at 15707 SW Walker Road. The proposed tennis court will include portable bleachers. No parking modifications are proposed. The Design Review request, BDR 99-00106, and Conditional Use request, CUP 99-00018, will be reviewed administratively. Therefore, no public hearing concerning these requests will be held unless the decisions are appealed. The applicant also requests approval of a Tree Preservation Plan, TPP 99-00009, to remove approximately nine trees on the site and plant approximately 27 trees. The Board of Design Review will review the Tree Preservation Plan. The site is within the Residential Urban Standard Density (R-7), and Commercial Industrial (CI) zone. The site is located at the northeast corner of NW Walker Road and NW 158th Avenue, and is approximately 90.41 acres in size. Map 1S1-05BA, Tax Lot 100; Map 1N1-32CD, Tax Lots 200 and 201.

Staff report by Mr. Osterberg indicated that this was a single application for a Tree Preservation Plan; a Type II Design Review which was Administrative and an Administrative Conditional Use Permit was required; and that, per standard procedure, the Public Hearing would be conducted first. If approved by the Board, the City Planning Director would send out a Notice of Approval and Conditional Use Permit Application. The issue at this meeting was the removal of trees and then planting of new replacement trees as proposed by the Applicant. Applicant has proposed the removal of nine trees, that are at the edge of the tree grove; the tennis court was sited at the western edge of this same grove. In their place, 24 replacement trees will be planted to provide desirable landscaping and will be placed to the north of the tennis court.

Staff has reviewed the criteria, it has been met by the proposal and staff has recommended Approval of the Request, with two Conditions, listed on Page 12.

Ms. Cannon commented that the plan indicated 27 trees, as did Ms. Crane. Twenty-seven was the correct number advised Chairman Straus. Ms. Crane questioned the location of the replacement trees in relationship to the park and swimming pool. It was noted that Applicant had a larger area plan that indicated the location of the proposed tennis court.

**APPLICANT:**

MR. JIM MCELHINNY, member of the staff of the Park District; 15707 SW Walker Road, Beaverton, Oregon 97006.

MR. ALLAN WELLS, Park Maintenance Coordinator and Certified Arborist for the Park District, 15707 SW Walker Road, Beaverton, Oregon 97006.

MR. BRIAN LEAHY, Board Member for the Greater Portland Tennis Council and Tennis Center Supervisor for the Tualatin Hills Park District, 15707 SW Walker Road, Beaverton, Oregon 97006.

Mr. Leahy provided a brief background of the project. The Park District had been approached by the Council of Greater Portland to work with the Park District in raising funds to construct a tennis court that would be dedicated to a two-fold use: first for tournaments; and secondly for general play and lessons. The Park District Board of Directors accepted the offer, the single tennis court was sited and configured as illustrated to accommodate a number of things. It had a north/south configuration in consideration of sun; it was located so as to avoid the trees on the site that they wanted to preserve and maintain; accessibility.

Mr. Beighley commented that it looked like a center court presentation, that was being moved uptown. Mr. Leahy agreed.

Mr. McElhinny commented that as tournaments were scheduled, bleachers could be moved in and out. Mr. Beighley asked about future lighting. Mr. McElhinny responded that was not in the plans before them, possibly in the future; and that lighting was a fund driven feature.

Seating capacity was discussed. Mr. Leahy indicated that on a temporary basis, the current portable bleacher arrangement could accommodate 500 spectators. It was noted that permanent seating was also a fund driven item. Mr. Beighley asked what the ultimate capacity would be, Mr. McElhinny answered 2200 seats on a temporary basis.

Chairman Straus asked about accommodating the weather. Mr. McElhinny stated that they do have an inflatable bubble for winter months for cover. It has been successful.

The site plan was shown with regard to the specific locations of the outdoor courts, the athletic center, and 50 meter swim center. The design was such that it provided the greatest amount of protection from noise for the neighbors, and the best access to the facility.

Ms. Crane addressed the issue of parking with regard to the possible seating arrangement. Mr. McElhinny responded that they had 827 spaces and a crossover agreement with

Cornell Oaks Development, north, which had a usable 225 spaces. Of course, scheduling of special events would not coincide. He assured there was ample parking to support program issues.

Ms. Cannon MOVED and Mr. Beighley SECONDED a motion to approve TPP99-00009, Tennis Court Addition At Howard Terpenning, based on the testimony, reports and exhibits presented during the public hearing on the matter and upon the background facts, findings, and conclusions found in the Staff Report dated August 12, 1999, including Conditions one through two.

The question was called and the motion CARRIED unanimously.

Meeting ADJOURNED at 9:45 pm..